DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 014 CG 006 077

AUTHOR Land, H. Kenneth; Allen, Richard F.
TITLE The Role of the Counselor Redefined. Behavior of Students Redefined.
INSTITUTION American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention in New Orleans, Louisiana, March 22-26, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns, *Behavior Rating Scales, Counselor Functions, *Counselor Role, *Inservice Education, Males, Measurement Instruments, Student Teacher Relationship, Teacher Guidance, Teacher Role, *Test Construction, *Underachievers

ABSTRACT

Since it is difficult to determine behavior categories for students in the North Carolina Advancement School, the Devereus Behavior Rating Scale was revised to fill this void. After analyzing results on the complete test, four factors were picked which seemed most descriptive of underachievers: aggression, alienation, anxiety, and activity. A total of 22 items were constructed consisting of the four behavior factors, the test was standardized, and is now being used successfully to identify potential male underachievers. The second paper discusses a change in the role of the counselor, mainly that the teachers be given in-service training to learn the approaches of the counselor and then deal with the emotional aspects of learning using these techniques. In turn the counselor can keep abreast of the specific problems encountered by the teacher with which he will ultimately deal. (Author/KJ)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEHAVIOR OF STUDENTS REDEFINED

by Richard F. Allen

As we have observed the underachiever, whom we define as a student with average or above-average intelligence who is working at least a year behind his expected grade placement in academic subjects, we have begun to suggest that there may be certain behavior characteristics common to underachievers. Perhaps behavior is a factor in the etiology of underachievement, but no way of determining behavior categories that are meaningful has been available and appropriate for the North Carolina Advancement School population.

The literature points to the classroom behavior of a student as being a factor in his academic performance, yet little research exists which clearly defines underachievers in terms of behavior. Few instruments to measure behavior systematically and in meaningful ways are available. Those that do exist are either long, complicated, have not been adequately standardized or do not discriminate between the underachiever and the average child.

A review of past studies shows also that little investigation has been made into behavior of underachievers on the elementary and junior high levels.

Lewis (2) found that underachievers were less dependable, less original, less self-reliant and investigated their

CG 006 077

surroundings less than overachievers. Among other factors, Durr and Schmatz (1) discovered that underachievers were withdrawing, showed less satisfaction with school work and were prone to fears. Ross (4) also found that underachievers were withdrawn. Morrison (3), using the Thematic Apperception Test, discovered that underachievers were hostile to authority and were judged more passive-aggressive by their teachers. Swift and Spivack (5) identified eleven behavioral factors related to achievement among elementary school children (grades one through six) and devised the Devereux Behavior Rating Scale which was used by the Advancement School in an initial attempt to define the behavior of underachievers.

Most studies on underachievement relate underachievement to personality variables or demographic data rather than to behavioral acts. In addition, many studies compare underachievers to overachievers or high achievers rather than to the normal population. Researchers agree that further research is necessary into underachievement and specifically into the relationship of underachievement to behavior.

The Advancement School was dissatisfied with previous behavior rating scales because either they were not discriminatory enough, they required interpretive judgments on the part of the rater, or they were too long to be used with large numbers of students. We needed further knowledge regarding the behavior of

underachievers as we observed them in the total environment of a residential setting. This led us to ask the following questions:

1. Can we determine if certain kinds of behavior are unique to underachievers?
2. Are there unique categories of underachievement which can be defined by different kinds of behavior?
3. Can we develop an instrument which categorizes underachievement by behavior?

Perhaps answers to these questions would allow us to identify potential underachievers through analyzing behavior, and to classify underachievement in such a way as to provide different kinds of treatment for different kinds of underachievement within the classroom.

Our efforts to answer these questions were begun in the fall of 1968 when we asked teachers of all applicants to rate the boys on the Devereux Behavior Rating Scale. Completed ratings were obtained on one hundred sixth-grade boys who qualified as underachievers and one hundred who did not qualify according to the admissions criteria of the North Carolina Advancement School. The results of these ratings for both groups were compared to determine which behavioral characteristics were most descriptive of underachievers. Out of eleven subscales, only four--anxiety, work habits, restlessness, and withdrawal--were different for underachievers.

In addition, the six counselors at the Advancement School were asked during the spring of 1969 to identify the kind of behavior which they felt was causing each boy the most problems. Four kinds of behavior--withdrawal, dependency, aggressiveness, and hyperactivity--were identified as being possessed by at least twenty percent of the sixth-grade boys enrolled.

From these two sources, six categories were selected as incorporating the types of behavior most frequently exhibited by underachievers at the Advancement School. These were aggressiveness, anxiety, dependency, hyperactivity, passivity, and poor work habits.

Behavioral items descriptive of these categories as they would apply in the classroom were then written and placed randomly in an experimental behavior inventory. Because of the need to keep the inventory brief, only four items were used for each category. All items were written to apply to any grade level and were written in such a way as to encourage the rating of observed behavior rather than attempting to determine underlying factors causing the behavior. A scale was then devised which would allow a teacher to rate a student on each item along a scale from 1 ("never applies") to 5 ("always applies").

During the following year, all applicants to the North Carolina Advancement School for the summer and fall terms of 1969 and the spring term of 1970 were rated by their home school

teachers on this experimental inventory. A factor analysis was run on all 518 behavior inventories of students who had applied during this period. The resulting data indicated the existence of four factors rather than the six original categories. These initial four factors were tentatively labeled: Active Aggression, Passive Alienation, Personal Anxiety, and Social Anxiety.

Active Aggression referred to students who demonstrated overt hostility and hyperactivity through restlessness, picking on others and rebelling against authority. These students were considered behavior problems by their teachers.

Passive Alienation was demonstrated by students who were forgetful, did not participate in class activities, and were lazy. They were often erroneously labeled "slow learners" and caused frustration to parents and teachers.

Personal Anxiety referred to students who craved adult attention and were tense and nervous. They demanded inordinate amounts of time from the teacher.

Social Anxiety was demonstrated by students who were alone a lot and were not liked by classmates. They were the hardest for the teachers to reach because they were so withdrawn.

The Student Behavior Inventory was redesigned (see Appendix II) with these initial factors taken into account. The inventory now consisted of twenty-two items which made up the four behavioral factors. A twenty-third research item was added in preparation for standardization of the inventory. This research item was

included to allow the teacher to indicate those students in his class who were underachievers. A comparison of responses to the research item with the scores on each of the four initial behavioral factors would allow us to validate the inventory.

The standardization of the Student Behavior Inventory began in January, 1970, when 200 randomly selected teachers of grades four through eight throughout the state of North Carolina were asked to rate every student in one of their classes. Care was taken to insure a representative sample. Although only boys have attended the Advancement School, both boys and girls were rated in the standardization process since data on underachieving girls could be used in the future at the Advancement School. Schools were randomly picked from all those who had nominated students to the Advancement School. The plan was to conduct another factor analysis on this larger norm group with the idea that new factors could perhaps be identified. Since the norm group was much larger than the original group and was representative of a typical school population rather than just underachievers, factors identified from this group would be more meaningful in describing possible behavioral goals for underachievers. A total of 4,089 students was rated. Table 1 gives the description of the norm group according to sex, race, grade, and size of community. These data indicated that the norm sample was representative of the North Carolina public school child in grades four through eight.

The factor analysis run on the 4,089 inventories revealed a slight shift from the initial factors. Four factors were identified, but the items were redistributed slightly. The two anxiety factors (social and personal) were combined into one factor and a new factor which we labeled Activity was included. The final four factors were re-labeled Aggression, Alienation, Anxiety, and Activity.

By Aggression we are referring to behavior of students who break rules and talk back to teachers. They lose their temper easily and cry easily when provoked. They present problems to their classmates by picking on smaller children and annoying and teasing their peers. In turn, they are picked on and called names. They tend to solve conflicts by fighting and hitting others. Their hostility and aggression create constant classroom disruption.

Alienation is demonstrated by students who daydream in class. They are often called lazy and require constant prodding. They waste time and when they start something, they give up easily. They constantly lose or misplace materials and books; thus they rarely do assigned work. They appear somewhat withdrawn and seldom volunteer anything or participate in class discussions. Although they do not disrupt the classroom, these students cause frustration for the teacher by being forgetful, by refusing to work, and by not being part of the class.

Anxiety is represented by students who crave adult attention; they want to sit near the teacher and often seek the teacher's approval. They worry about knowing the right answers and want directions repeated. Their tenseness and nervousness increase under even the slightest pressure. They prefer to be alone rather than with classmates in social situations. They demand much of the teacher's time and do not work well on their own or with peers.

Activity is the factor represented by behavior such as not being able to sit still in class, being physically restless, interrupting others, and being a compulsive talker. In addition, students who exhibit this type of behavior cannot seem to concentrate for long periods of time. This hyperactivity can, and often does, become a disruptive element within the classroom.

These four factors--Aggression, Alienation, Anxiety, and Activity--represent four distinctly different kinds of behavior. In analyzing the 4,089 behavior inventories of the norm group, means and standard deviations of these four factors were computed by sex, race, grade, and size of community (See Table 2).

No difference appears in the size of community in relation to behavior. There is a significant difference in behavior in relation to sex, with males being more aggressive, alienated, and active. There is, however, no difference in anxiety between males and females. White students were rated as significantly

less aggressive, alienated, anxious, and active than non-white students. Also there is a tendency for all four behavioral factors to increase as the grades increase, except for the sixth grade, where overt behavior as represented by each factor significantly decreases. Behavior differences between the sexes is probably due to different social expectations. Differences due to race may be due also to the social expectations of teachers, although since no data on the race of the rating teachers was collected, further analysis of this is difficult.

There was a consistently lower rating of behavior for students in the sixth grade. More research needs to be done on this, but perhaps the reason the Advancement School has been most comfortable working with, and most successful with, sixth graders is that their overt behavior problems are less severe.

In order to establish norms by sex for each grade, means and standard deviations were figured separately for males and females in grades four through eight. A comparison of an individual's score on the Student Behavior Inventory to the appropriate sex and grade norm group (Tables 3 and 4) will give an indication of how much his behavior deviates from the norm.

Comparisons on each of the four factors were made between students who were rated 5 ("always applies") on the research item indicating underachievement and students who were rated 1 ("never applies"). The results (Tables 5 and 6) clearly indicate

that there is a difference between the behavior of underachievers and non-underachievers with underachievers being more aggressive, alienated, anxious, and active. Multiple correlations between teacher ratings on the four factors with the research item ranged between .70 and .76. The best single predictor was the alienation factor, where correlations ranged between .70 and .76 depending upon grade level. Further analysis of this data will include the use of regression techniques to determine the ability of the behavior scores to predict the degree of underachievement as defined by the research item.

The Student Behavior Inventory has already been used in various research projects currently underway at the Advancement School. Being a research institution, the North Carolina Advancement School will find many uses for such an instrument in the future. The whole student body of a public primary school (grades one through four) has been rated on the inventory. Potential underachievers have been identified by their behavior in the first grade. This group will be followed over the next few years in a longitudinal study to determine the predictive validity of the instrument. Also, the teachers in the same school have been involved in an inservice training program to better help underachievers. The effect this program has on changing the behavior of students will be measured by using our Student Behavior Inventory. It is hoped that this instrument

will aid the classroom teacher in identifying underachievers early enough to remedy the problem before it becomes extreme.

Little research has been done on the problem of underachievement among girls. The need for accumulating data and beginning research in this area has been recognized by the Advancement School. The standardization data we have on the behavior of girls as rated on the Student Behavior Inventory will prove valuable when this work begins.

The Advancement School is currently involved in research in various counseling treatments. We are attempting to improve our observational techniques and to evaluate the effectiveness of our counseling program. The Student Behavior Inventory is one of a series of instruments which is providing us with some exciting data. Each teacher and counselor at the school evaluates every two weeks each child he teaches by using the Student Behavior Inventory. Through these ratings, we are able to measure the on-going effect of various counseling and teaching approaches. Specifically in counseling, we are trying to determine the effects of four different treatments: Individual counseling, no counseling, play therapy, and play without therapy. Through the Student Behavior Inventory we are able to measure immediate changes in students in each treatment group and tentatively suggest those treatments which contributed to the observed change. Our next speaker is directly involved with me in much of this counseling research utilizing the Student Behavior Inventory.

The Advancement School will certainly make greater and greater use of this instrument. We suspect that other research projects and other schools will also find value in the Student Behavior Inventory, not only as an instrument to be used by counselors to redefine behavior and identify potential underachievers, but also as a means to classify students for specific treatment programs in the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Durr, W. K. and Schmatz, R. R. "Personality Difference Between High Achieving and Low Achieving Gifted Children," Reading Teacher, 1964, 251-254.

2. Lewis, W. D. "Comparative Study of the Personalities, Interests, and Home Backgrounds of Gifted Children of Superior and Inferior Intellectual Achievement," Pedagogy Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1941, 59, 207-218.

3. Morrison, Evelyn. "Underachievement Among Preadolescent Boys Considered in Relationship to Passive Aggression," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 168-173.

4. Ross, R. "A Description of Twenty Arithmetic Underachievers," Arithmetic Teacher, 1964, 235-241.

5. Swift, Marshall and Spivack, George. "The Assessment of Achievement Related Classroom Behavior: Normative, Reliability, and Validity Data," Journal of Special Education, 1968, 2, 137-149.

APPENDIX I

TABLES

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA DESCRIBING
THE STANDARDIZATION SAMPLE
FOR THE NCAS STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Sex		Race		Size of Community		
Male	Female	White	Non-White	Under 10,000	10,000-60,000	Over 60,000
2077	2012	2795	1294	2435	792	859

Grade				
4	5	6	7	8
821	665	1029	996	578

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EACH OF THE FOUR FACTORS
(AGGRESSION, ALIENATION, ANXIETY, AND ACTIVITY)
ON THE STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY BY SEX, RACE, GRADE, AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY

		Sex		Race		Grade					Size of Community		
		Male	Female	White	Non-White	4	5	6	7	8	Under 10,000	10,000-60,000	Over 60,000
N		2027	2012	2795	1294	821	665	1029	996	578	2435	792	859
Aggression	$\bar{X}$	15.71	12.90	13.54	16.05	13.67	14.85	13.14	15.29	15.13	14.47	14.30	13.96
	S.D.	7.13	5.99	6.47	6.99	6.72	6.80	5.80	7.02	7.04	6.71	6.58	6.96
Alienation	$\bar{X}$	21.29	17.73	18.42	21.96	18.97	19.91	18.14	20.51	20.72	19.61	19.58	19.29
	S.D.	8.87	7.78	8.40	8.32	8.66	8.32	8.36	8.34	8.86	8.32	8.51	9.15
Anxiety	$\bar{X}$	8.86	8.85	8.73	9.13	8.40	9.19	8.33	9.34	9.22	8.75	9.01	9.01
	S.D.	3.24	3.20	3.35	2.90	3.29	3.12	3.10	3.20	3.25	3.15	3.20	3.40
Activity	$\bar{X}$	5.26	4.21	4.57	5.12	4.74	5.05	4.44	4.82	4.85	4.77	4.62	4.81
	S.D.	2.46	2.22	2.36	2.47	2.48	2.46	2.30	2.40	2.38	2.41	2.28	2.52

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FOUR FACTORS ON THE NORTH CAROLINA ADVANCEMENT SCHOOL STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY STRATIFIED BY SEX AND SCHOOL GRADE

Variables			School Grade				
			Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight
Factor 1 ACTIVITY	Boys	N	408	325	513	537	293
		$\bar{X}$	5.33	5.41	4.94	5.40	5.33
		S.D.	2.58	2.56	2.34	2.43	2.43
	Girls	N	413	340	516	459	284
		$\bar{X}$	4.15	4.71	3.94	4.13	4.34
		S.D.	2.22	2.32	2.16	2.17	2.23
Factor 2 AGGRESSION	Boys	N	408	325	513	536	294
		$\bar{X}$	14.99	16.30	14.52	16.77	16.23
		S.D.	7.33	7.44	6.31	7.48	6.85
	Girls	N	413	340	516	458	284
		$\bar{X}$	12.36	13.46	11.77	13.56	14.00
		S.D.	5.78	5.80	4.87	6.45	7.07
Factor 3 ANXIETY	Boys	N	407	325	513	537	294
		$\bar{X}$	8.11	8.95	8.46	9.39	9.54
		S.D.	3.28	3.17	3.10	3.12	3.40
	Girls	N	413	340	515	459	284
		$\bar{X}$	8.68	9.42	8.20	9.28	8.88
		S.D.	3.27	3.06	3.10	3.28	3.05
Factor 4 ALIENATION	Boys	N	407	323	512	537	294
		$\bar{X}$	20.99	21.22	20.06	22.03	22.56
		S.D.	8.98	8.80	8.72	8.59	9.30
	Girls	N	413	340	516	459	284
		$\bar{X}$	16.98	18.66	16.24	18.72	18.82
		S.D.	7.86	7.64	7.52	7.67	7.96

TABLE 4

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR FOUR FACTORS ON THE
NORTH CAROLINA ADVANCEMENT SCHOOL STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY
STRATIFIED BY SEX, GRADE, AND SEX BY GRADE (GRADES 4-8)

Variable	Source of Variance	d.f.	F	p
Factor 1 ACTIVITY	Sex	1,4078	186.97	<.01
	Grade	4,4078	7.06	<.01
	Sex by Grade	4,4078	1.65	N.S.
Factor 2 AGGRESSION	Sex	1,4077	169.03	<.01
	Grade	4,4077	15.51	<.01
	Sex by Grade	4,4077	0.58	N.S.
Factor 3 ANXIETY	Sex	1,4077	0.00	N.S.
	Grade	4,4077	18.16	<.01
	Sex by Grade	4,4077	5.11	<.01
Factor 4 ALIENATION	Sex	1,4075	171.16	<.01
	Grade	4,4075	12.33	<.01
	Sex by Grade	4,4075	0.93	N.S.

TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FOUR FACTORS OF THE STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY FOR STUDENTS RATED ON THE RESEARCH ITEM AT EXTREME ENDS OF THE SCALE, STRATIFIED BY GRADE

School Grade	Rating	N	Factor 1 ACTIVITY		Factor 2 AGGRESSION		Factor 3 ANXIETY		Factor 4 ALIENATION	
			$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
4	Never Applies	229	3.38	2.14	10.38	4.47	6.75	3.06	10.86	4.46
	Always Applies	91	6.32	2.77	18.36	8.67	9.11	6.75	30.57	6.05
5	Never Applies	116	3.61	2.08	10.40	4.16	7.22	2.99	10.89	3.86
	Always Applies	76	6.89	2.62	20.41	8.64	10.30	3.46	29.41	6.62
6	Never Applies	267	3.06	1.72	9.72	3.06	6.70	2.80	10.97	4.71
	Always Applies	37	6.78	2.64	19.54	6.80	9.41	3.83	30.19	6.62
7	Never Applies	158	3.01	1.65	10.34	4.10	7.56	3.36	11.20	4.47
	Always Applies	113	6.32	2.59	20.13	8.68	10.12	3.46	29.15	7.13
8	Never Applies	90	3.56	1.93	10.77	4.08	7.87	3.38	10.86	3.97
	Always Applies	84	5.64	2.53	17.73	7.62	9.34	3.40	30.69	7.76

19

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE (F-RATIOS)
COMPARING STUDENTS RATED AT EXTREME ENDS OF THE RESEARCH ITEM
ON EACH BEHAVIORAL FACTOR OF THE STUDENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Factor	School Grade				
	4	5	6	7	8
ACTIVITY	103.72	93.20	131.33	164.56	37.71
AGGRESSION	116.56	115.17	227.76	153.16	57.43
ANXIETY	35.78	43.27	27.55	37.26	8.25
ALIENATION	1028.66	598.71	484.02	646.97	458.74

Note: All F's signigicant ($p < .01$)

ED 046014

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELOR REDEFINED

by H. Kenneth Land

The two previous papers have described much of what we have learned through our work with underachievers at the North Carolina Advancement School. We know from our studies that underachievers generally have poor self-concepts--they see themselves unfavorably in school, social, and family situations. They have withdrawn from competition through either passive or aggressive behavior. Rather than assume responsibility for their own successes and failures, they tend to place the blame on external factors--teachers, school, parents. Such a description indicates that the underachiever has emotional problems which prevent him from succeeding in the classroom.

In working with underachievers the goal of the Advancement School is that of effecting positive change in attitudes and behavior. This goal is based on the belief that the emotional problems of the child must be dealt with before productive learning can take place. Until the underachiever recognizes his problems and begins to seek help in solving them, remedial programs to develop academic skills cannot succeed. He must view himself more favorably as a learner before achievement can take place.

CG 006 077

For these reasons, counseling is the basis for the treatment program at the Advancement School. Counseling underlies every aspect of the instructional program, while academic work is of secondary importance. In fact, the primary requirement for the Advancement School faculty is the ability to develop sensitivity to the needs of children.

For purposes of definition, the Advancement School counselor is a teacher who receives inservice education specifically in counseling techniques. The teacher differs from the counselor in that the teacher is oriented only in the philosophic aspects of counseling. Both teachers and counselors are, in fact, teacher-counselors. Within the classroom, both teachers and counselors share the common goal of changing the students' attitudes about themselves as learners and helping the students assume responsibility for their own learning.

Classroom instruction at the Advancement School is individualized for all students, not only in skill areas such as reading and mathematics, but in the interest areas of science, art, music, and physical education. In addition to these classes, students participate daily in a two-hour humanities block, taught jointly by one teacher and one counselor. This team of teacher and counselor attempts, within a group setting, to help students better understand their problems and learn to cope with them. The humanities program offers the student an opportunity to analyze

his values, attitudes, beliefs, interests, and needs in order that he may relate more positively to himself, to his peers, and to society. As the student begins to recognize his needs and strengths and begins seeking help, he can then work on the development of specific skills. The team teacher, who has teaching responsibilities other than the humanities block, is often the one who helps the student in developing these skills.

Through this cooperative teaching, both the counselor and the teacher learn from observing and working with each other how best to implement both roles within the classroom, so that each truly becomes a teacher-counselor. The teacher is able to observe counseling techniques as they are implemented within the learning situation, and thus learn how to deal better with the emotional aspects of learning. In turn, the counselor can keep abreast of the specific problems encountered by the teacher with students, problems with which he must ultimately deal. Both teacher and counselor gain mutual respect for the skills each possesses, with the result that the personal and professional relationship between them is strengthened.

All counselors at the Advancement School were trained as teachers and have received only inservice education as counselors. The Advancement School proposes that all teachers should be able to implement within the classroom the philosophic tenets of good counseling, if they are provided help and guidance from a professional counselor. At the Advancement School such help comes

from a Coordinator of Counseling, who provides the inservice education for teachers and counselors.

It is my belief that most teachers, when they enter the teaching profession, are genuinely interested in children and want to help them to become successful individuals. This enthusiasm is usually dampened, through, by what can be called "the system." The priorities become those of covering a prescribed amount of subject matter, of serving as disciplinarians, of meeting arbitrary standards imposed by school officials. The real needs and concerns of children are soon relegated to the needs of the "system." I can remember vividly from my own experiences as a public school teacher, occasions when I felt guilty and threatened because I allowed time during class periods to be used for discussion of particular problems that concerned my eleventh-grade English students--problems which were not directly connected with the subject matter. The very fact that I felt guilty for allowing students to discuss matters of real concern to them is a gross condemnation of the public school system. I have on numerous occasions heard other teachers express this same frustration.

There are many adults who still possess fears acquired during their early school years: "Am I safe? Can I cope with this? Will I be accepted?" No child should be forced to carry these fears into adulthood because the opportunity for facing these fears was denied him in the classroom. We must dispel "the delusion of uniqueness," the notion students have that they are

different from others and therefore somehow inferior. The student must be given the opportunity to see that others feel unsure and have fears; that others in the class are much more <u>like</u> him than they are different from him.

The teacher must create in the classroom what Rogers has called <u>acceptance</u>. Such acceptance allows the child freedom to be himself, to express his fears, and to seek openly his place in society. In working with underachieving boys at the Advancement School, I have found that once the students feel the teacher truly accepts them, then they feel free to be honest about their fears and no longer feel they must deny their existence. Such openness creates an atmosphere in which learning can then take place.

A teacher can create this acceptance and openness more easily if he is the same person inside the classroom that he is outside. Perhaps the teacher's major responsibility is to provide the student with a positive figure with whom to identify. If the student is to grow in the desired qualities of tolerance, acceptance, and fair play, this can best be facilitated by identifying with and observing these positive qualities in his teacher. The teacher, therefore, should be honest with students and with himself. This honesty can lead to the creation of an atmosphere of acceptance in which the student can then be honest with himself.

The relationship's the thing! Try to recall your own former teachers. I will venture that you remember certain teachers,

not because of the subject matter they taught you, but because of either a very positive or a very negative student-teacher relationship. I will venture that you remember the teachers who, by their attitudes in the classroom, made you feel either very good or very bad as a human being.

These same qualities necessary for a good student-teacher relationship are basic to good counseling--acceptance of the individual, respect for his individuality, freedom to express his feelings. It is through such student-teacher relationships that teachers at the Advancement School help underachievers overcome the emotional barriers which inhibit learning, and develop positive attitudes and behavior. It is through such relationships that the emotional needs of students may be dealt with and more serious problems may be prevented.

Looking over a student's Tennessee Self-Concept scores is one thing, and listening to him as he relates stories and experiences which have contributed to these low scores is quite another thing. I have been appalled again and again by unsolicited accounts related by students about classroom experiences. No, let me say that I was not appalled so much by the related incidents (for surely many of these could not have occurred just as the students described them), but rather I was appalled by the feelings which these students were expressing as they talked about past school experiences. For these feelings of being misunderstood, of being treated unfairly, of being degraded, were, I am convinced, completely honest

and true. These feelings of gross inadequacy, of hopelessness, of alienation, yes, even of hate, were, I am convinced, completely honest and true. With feelings such as these bottled up within students, how is learning under the typical classroom situations likely to occur? We have at the Advancement School filing cabinets overflowing with evidence that learning under these conditions is not likely to occur.

Much of the work of the Advancement School is carried out in cooperation with public schools throughout the state. Schools in North Carolina are not unlike those found throughout most of the country. It has become increasingly obvious that teachers in our schools are not dealing with the real concerns and needs of the students they attempt to teach. It has also become obvious that little is being done to offer teachers help in meeting these concerns.

Counselors in the public schools are typically asked to serve the needs of between 300-1,000 boys and girls. Because of this large number of students, counselors cannot possibly hope to work individually with all the students in their schools. In most schools, counselors are mere extensions of the administration, faced with such tasks as recording attendance, assigning courses, and other non-professional tasks. Crisis counseling is about the extent to which most counselors are able to work with students.

If this is the reality within our schools, who then is to meet the emotional needs of the typical student? The answer is

clear: the classroom teacher must fill this role if it is to be filled. This is the reason for the Advancement School's experiment in counseling within the classroom. We are attempting to demonstrate that teachers can and properly should fill this role and that the public school counselor can most effectively be utilized in helping teachers carry out this role. This is why we propose that the role of the counselor must be redefined if the needs of students are to be met.

The role of the counselor, as we at the North Carolina Advancement School have redefined it, should be that of helping teachers develop the awareness and sensitivity needed to deal with the emotional aspects of learning. We are not proposing that teachers be trained to become counselors per se, but rather that teachers be guided toward an understanding of the effects that personal problems and personal feelings have upon the learning process.

Counselors can help teachers to reach this understanding through several possible ways. One promising method is through providing workshops or inservice education programs. Such programs should emphasize the need for recognizing and providing for the emotional needs of children. Emphasis should also be given to approaches to groups and individuals which lead to the creation of an atmosphere of acceptance and respect for the student. Through workshops, teachers should find help in understanding and implementing the elements of a good student-teacher relationship.

A further step in in filling the new role of the counselor is that of working with the teacher in the classroom setting. The counselor can best demonstrate the techniques and approaches which have been explored in the workshop setting by actually going into the classroom and discussing with students problems which are of concern to them. Such classroom discussions might be scheduled on a regular weekly basis. Through this experience the teacher would be able to observe and learn from the counselor while the counselor would gain insight into the problems faced by the teacher. Seeing the counselor use class time for such discussions would reinforce the importance of this approach for the teacher. This approach would also result in the student's realizing that indeed the school does care about his needs as a person as well as his academic needs. As the teacher becomes more comfortable with this approach, he would hopefully assume the sole responsibility for its implementation.

Perhaps the greatest task with which the counselor is faced in this new role is that of serving as an advocate for the teacher. The counselor must support and become identified with the efforts of teachers to make children the primary concern of schools. An atmosphere must be created which communicates to children the feeling that "we care about you and we respect your needs and your feelings." Such an atmosphere can be created only with the full commitment of the administration, and it is the counselor who must work on behalf of teachers to gain this commitment.

Such programs within the school would provide an atmosphere of acceptance and respect not only for students, but for teachers as well. This atmosphere would encourage teachers to express openly their frustrations and feelings. No longer would the teacher be forced to carry his frustrations to the teacher's lounge--now the only safe place in the school to vent his feelings. The resulting atmosphere created through openness of expression would enhance the personal dignity of the teacher and his role and create the opportunity to share with other professionals those problems and feelings with which he needs help.

The emphasis of this paper in redefining the counselor's role has been on helping the teacher assume the responsibility for applying those approaches which in the past have all too often been solely the responsibility of the counselor. There will always be a need for the professional counselor to work with students whose problems are so severe that they cannot be dealt with in the classroom. Such utilization of the special skills possessed by counselors should further enhance the counselor's effectiveness within the school.

This is the challenge which we believe must be met by the school counselor. We urge you as you "Focus on the Future," to consider this redefinition of the role of the counselor, to consider the needs of the children in our schools, and then to choose what we feel to be a reasonable course in bringing about the changes needed to meet this challenge.